

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think that's basically
2 correct. The purposes -- you know, showing ID today is
3 only for purposes of proving who you are. It's not to
4 prove where you live. So independent from the
5 requirement to show ID, either certificate or one of the
6 other authorized ID, there's a separate requirement in
7 the code where the election -- where the poll worker has
8 to ask every voter "Have you moved," so regardless of
9 what ID they show. And if they say yes, they've moved,
10 then they have to sign a statement of residence and
11 update their information. If they say no, they haven't,
12 they still live at the address on the list of registered
13 voters, then they are permitted to vote.

14 SEN. DAVIS: And what is your
15 understanding of whether -- how or whether that would
16 change under the requirements of the new bill if
17 everyone now is going to come in with a state-issued ID
18 or a driver's license? If the address on that ID does
19 not match the address that's on the voter file, how is
20 that to be handled going forward if this bill were to
21 pass into law?

22 MS. MCGEEHAN: My current understanding is
23 that that process wouldn't change, that the purpose of
24 SB 14 is, again, just to prove up ID, not prove where
25 you reside.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 SEN. DAVIS: And what steps would the
2 Secretary of State's Office engage in to assure that the
3 ID wasn't being used to establish an understanding of
4 the voter's residency?

5 MS. MCGEEHAN: Would definitely, I think,
6 be included in our training materials to emphasize that.

7 SEN. DAVIS: Currently, is there any
8 information that the Secretary of State's Office gathers
9 that breaks down by category voters in the state? And
10 when I say "by category," I mean by race, by gender, by
11 disability, by age.

12 MS. MCGEEHAN: We have some information.
13 We have -- we have age for sure. On gender -- we have
14 some information on gender, but it's not conclusive
15 because gender is now -- it used to be a required
16 element on the voter registration application. In 1995,
17 it was taken -- or it became optional after the National
18 Voter Registration Act. So we have some data on gender,
19 but, again, it's not complete.

20 Regarding ethnicity, we really -- we don't
21 have any information like that because it's not
22 collected when a person applies to register to vote.
23 The only data that we do have is we do have the number
24 of voters that have an Hispanic surname. And so we can
25 run the list of registered voters against this list of

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 Hispanic surnames that is provided by the census
2 department.

3 SEN. DAVIS: I'm sure you understand that
4 one of the sensitive issues that will arise as a
5 consequence of this legislation will be a question as to
6 whether the implementation of this law creates a
7 disproportionate impact on minorities, on seniors, on
8 the disabled, on women. How will the Secretary of
9 State's Office work to be able to answer those questions
10 when they are asked if we currently don't track that
11 data? And is there an intention to track it going
12 forward?

13 MS. MCGEEHAN: When we changed the voter
14 registration application in '94, '95, due to the
15 National Voter Registration Act, there was a long
16 discussion regarding this issue of whether the state
17 application should request a voter's race. The
18 determination at that time, based on feedback from all
19 the stakeholders, was not to do it because the thought
20 was that might be intimidating to a minority voter, "Why
21 are you asking, you know, what my ethnicity is? It
22 doesn't impact whether I can register or not."

23 We can revisit that issue because in order
24 to provide data, you know, if the legislature wants data
25 like that from the Secretary of State's Office, we have

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 to have some way to collect it. So we could revisit
2 putting that question or adding that as a question to
3 the voter registration application. I'd be happy to
4 visit on ways where we could try and collect that, but
5 right now we would not have the tools that we would need
6 to be able to collect that data.

7 SEN. DAVIS: It seems rather important as
8 implementation of this law advances that that
9 information be made available for the Justice Department
10 review as well as any judicial review that might occur
11 in terms of the impact of the implementation of the law.

12 I believe that's all the questions I have
13 for you. Thank you so much.

14 MS. MCGEEHAN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: The Chair recognizes
16 Senator West.

17 SEN. WEST: Thank you very much,
18 Mr. Chairman. Many of the questions Senator Davis has
19 already asked, but have you had a chance to look at the
20 bill as introduced?

21 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

22 SEN. WEST: Okay. Do you happen to have
23 it there in front of you?

24 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes, I do.

25 SEN. WEST: Okay. Great. Before I get

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 into it, does this bill provide you any rulemaking
2 authority?

3 MS. MCGEEHAN: No.

4 SEN. WEST: Okay. So in interpreting
5 the -- let me back up. Are you often called upon by
6 county registrars to answer questions concerning issues
7 that arise in local counties?

8 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

9 SEN. WEST: How do you normally decide
10 those questions? Do you just look at the black and
11 white law? Do you issue opinions? How is that --
12 what's that process?

13 MS. MCGEEHAN: We issue opinions in a
14 couple of different ways. We have a toll-free number.
15 One is dedicated just for county officials. So if it's
16 a fairly straightforward, simple question, we give a
17 quick answer over the phone. If it's a -- if it's a
18 less involved question, we might get an email. We'll
19 give a response via email. If it's something that's
20 hard or we're really interpreting several different laws
21 or it's a new law and we feel like it has statewide
22 impact, we want to make sure that everyone is operating
23 under the same understanding, we'll issue an advisory.

24 SEN. WEST: Okay. And so an advisory or
25 just depending upon the circumstances maybe an email

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 opinion or something like that?

2 MS. MCGEEHAN: Well, advisories are
3 usually a little more -- it's like the most formal that
4 we do.

5 SEN. WEST: Right.

6 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yeah. Okay.

7 SEN. WEST: All right. Let me ask you to
8 go to Page 4 of the bill.

9 MS. MCGEEHAN: Okay. Can you tell me the
10 section? Because I think I have a different format.

11 SEN. WEST: Okay. It's Section 7, and
12 Section 7(c) and (d).

13 MS. MCGEEHAN: Okay.

14 SEN. DAVIS: Let me know when you get
15 there.

16 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

17 SEN. WEST: Okay. It's my understanding
18 that the election officer that's being referred to in
19 Section (d) is -- is the individual working at the poll.
20 Is that right?

21 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

22 SEN. WEST: Okay. That person will be
23 called upon in Section (d) to determine if the voter's
24 name is on the precinct list of registered voters, and
25 the voter's identity can be verified from the

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 documentation presented. Is that correct?

2 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

3 SEN. WEST: Okay. In advising on that,
4 will that be a strict interpretation? Let me -- this is
5 what I mean. I think that some of the hypotheticals
6 that were provided by Senator Davis may be illustrative
7 of what I'm asking. My last name is West, W-e-s-t. And
8 say that there's a typographical error where my name is
9 spelled W-e-s on the voters' roll, precinct list, and
10 then my -- but my identity I'm using my driver's license
11 and it has "t" on it. How does a poll -- an election
12 officer in that situation resolve that problem?

13 MS. MCGEEHAN: That's a good question, and
14 I don't think the bill necessarily defines what
15 verification --

16 SEN. WEST: I know. Senator Fraser said
17 I'd have to ask the Secretary of State that question.
18 That's why I'm asking you that question.

19 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think -- you know, based
20 on the way the bill is written now and if we had to
21 develop training materials for the poll workers on how
22 to implement this, we would look to the best practices
23 of the states that have implemented. I heard Indiana
24 testify earlier today that they have written some
25 guidelines. We'd look to that and try and incorporate

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 the best practices on reasonable methods to verify the
2 ID document against the list of registered voters.

3 SEN. WEST: Okay. But you would agree
4 with me that in interpreting Section (c) and (d) without
5 some sort of guidance would lend itself to a great deal
6 of subjectivity; thus inconsistent application
7 throughout the state?

8 MS. MCGEEHAN: It could, yes.

9 SEN. WEST: Okay. As it relates to --
10 let's see. What page is it on? The next page, which
11 will be (h), it's in the same section.

12 MS. MCGEEHAN: Okay.

13 SEN. WEST: Would you read Section (h) and
14 tell me how you interpret that as the chief
15 administrator of the election laws in the state of Texas
16 next to, needless to say, Secretary of State?

17 MS. MCGEEHAN: (h) reads, "The
18 requirements for identification prescribed by Subsection
19 (b) do not apply to a voter who: (1) presents the
20 voter's voter registration certificate on offering to
21 vote; and (2) was 70 years of age or older on January 1,
22 2012, as indicated by the date of birth on the voter's
23 voter registration certificate."

24 The way I had -- until earlier this
25 afternoon when Senator Ellis asked the question, I had

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 assumed that anybody that is 70 years of age or older
2 would not have to provide the photo ID. I think the
3 wording is less than perfect. I think that's the
4 intent, and I heard Senator Fraser, I think, answer that
5 his intent is it would apply. You know, even if a
6 person became 70 after January 1, 2012, they could still
7 take advantage of this exception.

8 SEN. WEST: Okay. But would it be your
9 suggestion that we need to reword that language to make
10 certain that whether you're there or someone else -- I
11 understand that you're here and you heard the
12 discussion, but if for some reason you're not in the
13 same position you're in right now, there's going to be
14 someone else, and they won't have -- they will not have
15 had the benefit of this discussion. So, therefore, do
16 you think it would be advisory to -- advisory to reword
17 that to make certain it's perfectly clear?

18 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think so. If people are
19 reading it inconsistent, it would probably help it if it
20 were.

21 SEN. WEST: Okay. Now, a couple of other
22 questions. As it relates to the counties, it's my
23 understanding that you -- that your agency and maybe
24 either yourself or someone working for you put together
25 the fiscal note. Is that correct?

KENNEDY REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

512.474.2233

TX_00000823

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes. Our agency put it --
2 I helped.

3 SEN. WEST: Okay. Did someone under your
4 supervision contact local governments to determine the
5 impact, the fiscal impact, that implementation of this
6 will have?

7 MS. MCGEEHAN: No, we did not.

8 SEN. WEST: That was done by someone else?

9 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think LBB does that. We
10 just -- we just --

11 SEN. WEST: Provided the information?

12 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yeah. Right.

13 SEN. WEST: And based on your experience
14 when these types of changes -- let me back up.

15 How much experience have you had in this
16 particular area, that is, the election laws, in
17 administration of election laws?

18 MS. MCGEEHAN: I have been working in the
19 elections division for 21 years.

20 SEN. WEST: So you've had a little
21 experience, huh?

22 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

23 SEN. WEST: Okay. All right. As it
24 relates to when changes are made in state law of this
25 nature, is there an impact, a fiscal impact, on local

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 units of governments when they have to make changes to
2 comply with these types of changes or laws that are
3 being suggested?

4 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think it really depends
5 on what the change is. You know, if there's a new
6 mandate for a county or if the county has to do
7 something different, then obviously there would be a
8 fiscal impact.

9 SEN. WEST: Well, will -- and, again,
10 drawing on your expertise, will counties have to do
11 something different to implement this particular law?

12 MS. MCGEEHAN: They will have to -- they
13 are going to have to post information on their website
14 notifying the public what the new photo ID requirements
15 are.

16 SEN. WEST: Right.

17 MS. MCGEEHAN: When they issue voter
18 registration certificates, they are going to have to
19 mail out -- which they have to mail out every two years
20 under current law. The new certificates will have new
21 language, but -- informing voters of the voter ID
22 requirements, but that should be cost neutral because
23 they are already mailing out the voter registration
24 certificates.

25 The piece that I think might have a fiscal

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 impact is the training. If the counties have to change
2 up their training procedures much or do more training
3 because they want to make sure the word is out to all
4 their -- that might increase their training costs.

5 SEN. WEST: Okay. So there are some
6 factors that need to be taken into consideration as to
7 whether or not counties will be burdened with additional
8 cost to implement this law. Is that correct?

9 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

10 SEN. WEST: Okay. And would it be a fair
11 statement to say the larger the county, the more of the
12 burden -- of the financial burden -- well, that's not a
13 fair question.

14 Would it be a fair statement to say that
15 the larger the county, the larger the potential
16 financial obligation that they would have to encounter
17 in order to implement the law?

18 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think that's true, but I
19 can hear small counties say that it might be
20 proportional, you know, since their budgets are -- I
21 mean --

22 SEN. WEST: Right. It's all relative to
23 what your budgets are.

24 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yeah.

25 SEN. WEST: But the fact is that that --

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 do you -- is there any -- you've read the fiscal note
2 associated with this bill?

3 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

4 SEN. WEST: The \$2 million that's in the
5 fiscal note, does any of that go to the county to --
6 counties in order to implement this legislation?

7 MS. MCGEEHAN: No.

8 SEN. WEST: So any cost that is not
9 covered by the state for counties would be -- have to be
10 borne by the counties. Right?

11 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes, yes.

12 SEN. WEST: Okay. Now, as it relates
13 to -- is there any way that the Secretary of State's
14 Office can give us -- do an analysis or get with the
15 various counties to determine exactly what the fiscal
16 impact of implementing this legislation would be?

17 MS. MCGEEHAN: We could -- we could
18 certainly solicit that information from counties and ask
19 them what -- how they see this impacting them fiscally.

20 SEN. WEST: You could do that for each and
21 every one of the counties?

22 MS. MCGEEHAN: We can do it.

23 SEN. WEST: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
24 request that the Secretary of State's Office provides
25 the Senate an analysis of -- I shouldn't say an

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 analysis -- at least solicit from the various counties
2 what the fiscal implication is going to be in order to
3 implement this bill.

4 CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Okay. I think, Senator,
5 that will be an individual request from you, and then it
6 can be distributed to all members of the Senate --

7 SEN. WEST: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: -- whenever it's done.
9 You know, I doubt that that will be done by the time we
10 rise and report to the Senate.

11 SEN. WEST: Okay. We can't get it
12 tonight?

13 (Laughter)

14 SEN. WEST: I'm just joking with you.

15 CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: You won't be a very
16 popular guy if the --

17 SEN. WEST: I'd like --

18 (Laughter)

19 SEN. WEST: I'd like to get it as soon as
20 possible, though.

21 Let's see. No further questions. Thank
22 you very much.

23 MS. MCGEEHAN: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DUNCAN: Thank you, Senator West.
25 Senator Gallegos?

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 SEN. GALLEGOS: Let me ask you, I don't
2 know if you heard my question earlier to Senator Fraser
3 and he referred to you or the Secretary of State's
4 Office to answer it. My concern was in the fiscal note
5 that we ranked number two in the country in population.
6 And Missouri ranks number nineteenth, and to implement
7 their voter ID program, they came up with -- they only
8 have 5.9 million people. We have 25 million. They came
9 up with a fiscal note of 6 million in the first year and
10 then 4 million in the second year for a total of 10
11 million second and third. That's \$10 million. And you
12 just -- I think earlier testimony with Senator Davis,
13 you said once the 2 million runs out, that's it. Is
14 that what you said?

15 MS. MCGEEHAN: For -- yeah, the amount of
16 money we have for voter education is limited. So when
17 that runs out, that's all we have.

18 SEN. GALLEGOS: I guess my concern is if
19 Missouri only has 5.9 million people, just to implement
20 their voter ID program they start with 6 million in the
21 first year and 4 million in the second and third year
22 for a total of \$10 million, for just 5.9 million folks,
23 what are they -- you know, I don't -- what are they
24 doing as far as when they are reading the bill? I heard
25 that you said you're going by the bill, and that's how

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 you came up with your fiscal note. Is that correct?

2 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

3 SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. Well, then what are
4 they doing that we're not or, you know, how can you --
5 you know, for \$10 million for 5.9 million people and
6 we're only going to spend 2 million, I mean, what's the
7 difference?

8 MS. MCGEEHAN: I am not familiar with the
9 Missouri voter identification bill, and I did hear you
10 ask that earlier today, but I've been trying to listen
11 to all the questions. So we can -- we can research it
12 and see. Some states actually provide more to their
13 local county governments and print ballots and things
14 like that. I don't know if that's the situation in
15 Missouri, but I honestly don't know the answer to that
16 question because I don't know what the Missouri voter ID
17 law requires.

18 SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, it's a substantial
19 more amount of money than we're looking --

20 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yeah.

21 SEN. GALLEGOS: -- at the fiscal note that
22 you have -- that you've given this committee on Senate
23 Bill 14. And I just -- it concerns me that that amount
24 of money, if somebody is doing -- in the formula or
25 methodology that you came up with that number -- I mean,

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 is that a true number? I mean, you know, as far as are
2 we really doing voter education that should be done, you
3 know, on 25 million people as opposed to what Missouri
4 is doing with only 5.9? I mean, it just -- I mean, that
5 would send up a red flag to me. Wouldn't it you?

6 MS. MCGEEHAN: Sure. I would like to
7 understand those numbers because they are very
8 different.

9 SEN. GALLEGOS: You know, I -- if we're
10 going to mandate to Texans, you know, and then do it --
11 do a good educational program and Missouri is spending
12 \$10 million on their folks and we're only spending
13 2 million on ours, I'd like to know what the -- what the
14 difference is. Are their people better than ours? You
15 know, do they deserve, you know, more education? You
16 know, I just -- you know, with the population as opposed
17 to our population, you know, I don't -- you know, I'm a
18 little concerned there. You know, are we cutting our
19 folks short? Are we really going to do what you're
20 telling us that you're going to do as far as educating
21 the public out there on this bill?

22 And it just concerns me that, you know, we
23 see -- and I haven't even taken a comparison of the
24 other states. And we're number two, and Missouri is 19,
25 and they are spending 10 million bucks. You know, that

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 would concern me, and I would hope it would concern any
2 of the other Senators on this floor. Are we, you know,
3 really going to do -- in implementing this bill, are we
4 going to educate those folks out there?

5 Now, you know -- and I'd like that answer.
6 I mean, you can't answer it now, I understand, but I
7 would like an answer to that.

8 MS. MCGEEHAN: We'll get you an answer.

9 SEN. GALLEGOS: And a comparison on what
10 really your states that have implemented voter ID, how
11 much are they paying, you know, to implement the program
12 and what they do.

13 Now, on the fiscal note, it says you're
14 going to do TV and radio and some other things. I mean,
15 can you explain to this body the process on TV, or is it
16 going to be in different languages, or how are you going
17 to -- how are you going to split up the money? Who gets
18 the most? You know, I mean, it's not -- it's not
19 explained to us in the fiscal note how you're going to
20 spread the money around. And is that going to be
21 accessible to us or how the process is going to be, or
22 how much money are you going to spend in Harris County
23 as opposed to Lubbock, Texas or wherever?

24 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes, that would be
25 available. And, you know, the programs that we've done

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 previously, we have detailed records that show, you
2 know, where the media ran, and so we would -- that would
3 be a part of any program going future.

4 The way -- the way it has worked thus far,
5 the three statewide voter education programs that we
6 have done, is we've gone out for bid for a public
7 education firm. And then the first thing that firm does
8 is research, and they meet with stakeholders, and then
9 they craft the creative proposal. And then they turn
10 that into the actual media and do the media buys for TV,
11 radio and cycle, Internet and also print.

12 For the PSAs -- and I'm not the expert on
13 this -- but I understand that we pay for a certain
14 amount, and then we get some earned credit where TV
15 stations will run them for free. If you pay them, you
16 know, to run it once, they'll run it three times and
17 only charge you for once, something along those lines.

18 SEN. GALLEGOS: And is that going to be --
19 is there going to be access as far as different
20 languages in than budget?

21 MS. MCGEEHAN: Oh, yes. We -- our current
22 programs are in English and in Spanish, and in Harris
23 County, we've had a component for Vietnamese.

24 SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. Now, on Page 2 of
25 the bill under what y'all are going to do under voter --

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 under 31.012, Voter Identification, Senator West brought
2 it up about -- it says here you and -- your office and
3 the voter registrar of each county that maintains it
4 shall provide notice of the ID requirements as
5 prescribed by this change.

6 Now, my concern there is, is at the county
7 level -- you know, I think Senator West brought it up --
8 is how much is going to be incumbent on each county, you
9 know? I and others here on this floor represent the
10 largest county, Harris County, and Harris County is
11 already starting to lay off, and they have a shortfall,
12 and they are laying off as we speak right now. So, you
13 know -- and I see what it says in the bill, you know,
14 that you're going to get together with them. I mean,
15 are they going to have the money? Or where is the -- if
16 they don't have the money, where is the other money
17 going to come from? Other than the 2 million you
18 already have prescribed here and any federal matches
19 that come in, where is that money going to come if those
20 counties cannot provide?

21 MS. MCGEEHAN: I think that the bill
22 presumes that counties have a website, and so this
23 requirement is that they post, you know, the information
24 about the new photo ID requirements that the Secretary
25 of State's Office will actually prescribe. So we will

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 send that out to the counties, and then they'll have to
2 post it on their website.

3 Now, in light of the fiscal
4 circumstances -- and Senator West has asked us to do a
5 survey -- we'll probably get some very detailed
6 information, you know, as far as the counties' fiscal
7 circumstances, if they are going to have to take down
8 their websites or, you know, where they are going to
9 have to cut.

10 SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, you know, with all
11 due respect, I mean, we can presume a lot of things, and
12 I could presume a lot of things, you know, just on
13 anything, but I can tell you right now -- I'm not
14 presuming -- I know that they're laying off in Harris
15 County right now. That's not a presumption. That's a
16 fact; that's a fact. And they're also furloughing in
17 the City of Houston.

18 So, I mean, it just concerns me that this
19 section here that says you're going to work hand-in-hand
20 with each registrar in each county, and if those
21 counties are already going through a budget shortfall
22 like we are, then how can you presume that they're going
23 to have -- I'm just saying that this bill presumes that
24 they're going to have a website and they're going to
25 have people to handle the education.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 You can't presume anything if they're
2 laying off right now as we speak, and that's a fact.
3 Like I said, that's not a presumption. That concerns
4 me. And what I'm asking is that if that can't happen in
5 Harris County or any other county in this state, where
6 is the extra money? If they don't have, obviously, the
7 funds to provide what is prescribed under Senate Bill
8 14, where is that money going to come from?

9 MS. MCGEEHAN: Well, you know, Senate Bill
10 14 doesn't make an appropriation to the county, so I
11 don't know the answer to your question on that because,
12 like I said, the bill -- I think the assumption is that
13 counties have a website. So if they're not going to
14 have a website --

15 SEN. GALLEGOS: But the bill prescribes
16 that you will work in conjunction with the county
17 registrar. Is that what I'm reading --

18 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

19 SEN. GALLEGOS: -- or am I reading the
20 wrong bill?

21 MS. MCGEEHAN: Maybe I'm not -- the way I
22 read that was that we would provide them the wording,
23 the language that they would put up on their website.

24 SEN. GALLEGOS: Well, you're going to
25 provide them with that. But what about the bodies and

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 any other education that's prescribed by this bill? If
2 they don't have the bodies -- they're laying off bodies
3 right now.

4 MS. MCGEEHAN: Yes.

5 SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. And you see where
6 I'm going here?

7 MS. MCGEEHAN: No, I understand.

8 SEN. GALLEGOS: And if you provided a
9 fiscal note, you know, that we're going by and that's on
10 every website in the State of Texas, everybody that has
11 a computer, then really what I'm asking you, is this a
12 true fiscal note or is it misleading to the voters out
13 there, that it's going to cost more than what you're
14 showing here if other counties are having budget
15 shortfalls like we are?

16 MS. MCGEEHAN: Well, when we're asked to
17 submit a fiscal note to LBB, they want to know what the
18 state impact is. So generally we don't solicit what the
19 impact is to local government. And I'm not exactly sure
20 who within LBB does that, if that's LBB or the
21 Comptroller. But I can tell you -- and maybe we've been
22 doing them wrong, but the way we've understood our
23 requirement in responding to a fiscal note request was
24 to state what the state impact was. It's specifically
25 for the agent -- you know, like for our agency for the

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 Secretary of State's office.

2 SEN. GALLEGOS: Okay. So what you're
3 telling me is that outside of the \$2 million that's in
4 the fiscal note and that under this section that you're
5 going to work with the registrar in each county, then we
6 just have to roll the dice and hope that the money is
7 there. Is that what you're telling me?

8 MS. MCGEEHAN: Well, I think this fiscal
9 note that LBB did put -- does indicate that there may be
10 some county costs. You know, they did put some numbers
11 in for Tarrant County and for Bexar County. So, you
12 know, it's not -- I don't think it's the number you're
13 looking for. It's not a comprehensive number, but I
14 think that the fiscal note does indicate that there may
15 be a fiscal impact on counties.

16 SEN. GALLEGOS: There may be a fiscal
17 impact. You don't know how much?

18 MS. MCGEEHAN: No, I don't.

19 SEN. GALLEGOS: So what we're looking at
20 in your fiscal note is just an open-ended fiscal note.
21 Is that what you're telling me?

22 MS. MCGEEHAN: The fiscal note is really
23 showing the impact on the Secretary of State's office.
24 I can't really speak to how the portion of the fiscal
25 note that concerns impact on local government, how

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 14 1/25/2011

1 LBB -- you know, what their process is. I don't really
2 know.

3 SEN. GALLEGOS: All right. Then let me
4 rephrase my question.

5 MS. MCGEEHAN: Okay.

6 SEN. GALLEGOS: So the \$2 million that
7 you're showing is what the state is going to be
8 impacted. And the language that is showing you're going
9 to work in conjunction with the counties, you know, you
10 cannot speak to that, so we really don't know. Is that
11 what you're saying? It could or could not be impacted
12 for a million, two million, three million, whatever the
13 number. I don't know the numbers that you gave Bexar
14 County and Tarrant County. I have not been privy to
15 those numbers. But what I'm saying is, I really would
16 like to know that if my county is going to be impacted,
17 if at all, it's going to be in here, you know. Do you
18 see what I'm saying?

19 MS. MCGEEHAN: Well, yes, I understand
20 what you're saying. And we are going to be sending out
21 a survey to try and gather that data from all the
22 counties.

23 SEN. GALLEGOS: You know, I don't like the
24 mandate to my county, something that this bill said that
25 they will do and then find out that they don't have the